

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to correct an apparent typographical error, and claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 15-18, 20-27, and 31 have been amended.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the foregoing amendments claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-43 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action at pages 2-4, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 7-9, 14-18, 20-27, 29-37, and 39-43 under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of Sawada et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/21663). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

By way of review, Sawada et al. teaches, among other features, a battery pack 22 which includes a reproducing device 23. The battery pack 22 is connectable to and powers a telephone 21. The battery pack 22 includes a ROM 42 and a RAM 43, and further receives a semiconductor memory 3, which is removable as shown in FIGs. 6 and 7. In addition, the battery pack 22 has a jack 25 which outputs audio reproduced by the reproducing device 23 and which is stored as MPEG 3 and ATRAC data on the semiconductor memory 3. (Paragraphs 0050, 0051, 0055; FIGs. 7-9).

During reproduction, the central processing unit (CPU) 31 of the telephone unit 21 sends a command CNT to a CPU 41 of the battery pack 22. Using a program read from the ROM 42, the CPU 41 retrieves audio data from the memory 3 and stores the retrieved audio data in the RAM 43 while an audio device 38 and a digital signal processor 44 reproduces the audio data. (Paragraph 0049; FIG. 8). However, there is no suggestion that the CPU 31 stores data in the RAM 43, that the RAM 43 is capable of long term storage of data supplied by the CPU 31, or that the CPU 31 also stores the audio data in the semiconductor memory 3.

In contrast, claim 1 recites, among other features, that "the electronic device stores data in the built-in main memory and the detachable auxiliary memory." As such, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 1.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 8, 15, and 22.

Similarly, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. does not disclose or suggest that "said electronic device retrieves data over a network and stores the retrieved data in the built in

memory unit" as recited in claim 17; that "the built-in memory comprises a basic recording capacity for the memory, and the removable memory comprises an increased recording capacity in addition to the basic recording capacity such that the electronic device stores the information independent of whether the auxiliary memory is connected to the battery" as recited in claim 18; or "forming a communication pathway to transfer information between the electronic device and the built in memory unit when the removable memory unit is removed" as recited in claim 31.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 23 and 24.

In addition, while Sawada et al. discloses a jack 25 for use in outputting reproduced audio through a head receiver 4, there is no suggestion that the jack 25 is able to otherwise power another electronic device. In contrast, claim 2 recites, among other features, "a primary power connection to connect to and power a controller of said electronic device, and a secondary power output port to connect to and power a controller of another device." As such, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 2.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 9, 20, 21, 26, and 27.

Further, while Sawada et al. suggests using the battery pack 22 with a portable telephone in paragraph 0044, and discloses that memory cards are used in both portable telephones and personal digital assistants in paragraph 0004, there is no suggestion that the battery pack 22 would be useable in other devices. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Sawada et al. does not disclose or suggest that "said electronic device comprises a personal computer" as recited in claim 16.

Lastly, the Examiner rejects claims 39-43 in view of Sawada et al. As a point of clarification, claims 39-43 depend from claim 38, which the Examiner admits is not anticipated by Sawada et al. on page 5 of the Office Action. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 39-43 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from claim 38.

Claims 7, 14, 25, 29, 30, and 32-37 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from corresponding claims 1, 8, 22, and 31.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action at page 5, the Examiner rejects claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Sawada et al. and the Examiner's taking Official Notice. The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Even assuming arguendo that the Examiner is correct in taking Official Notice, the Examiner does not rely on the Official Notice to cure the above noted deficiency of Sawada et al. as applied to claim 31, from which claim 38 depends. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 38 due at least to the combination not disclosing or suggesting the invention recited in claim 31.

In the Office Action at page 5, the Examiner rejects claims 3, 10, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Sawada et al. and Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,448). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner relies on col. 6, lines 30-34, of Cooper as disclosing a communication port, but not as otherwise curing the above noted deficiencies of Sawada et al. as applied to corresponding claims 1, 8 and 15, from which claims 3, 10, and 19 correspondingly depend. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 3, 10, and 19 due at least to the combination not disclosing or suggesting the invention recited in claims 1, 8 and 15.

In the Office Action at page 6, the Examiner rejects claims 4, 5, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Sawada et al., Cooper, and Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,524,122). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner relies on FIGs. 3 and 4 and col. 5, lines 49-55 and col. 7, lines 37-60, of Johnson et al. as disclosing the sliding communication port, but not as otherwise curing the above noted deficiencies of the combination of Sawada et al. and Cooper as applied to corresponding claims 1 and 8, from which claims 4, 5, 11, and 12 correspondingly depend. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 4, 5, 11, and 12 due at least to the combination not disclosing or suggesting the invention recited in claims 1 and 8.

In the Office Action at page 7, the Examiner rejects claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Sawada et al. and Miyoshi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/44331). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner relies on paragraph 39 of Miyoshi et al. as disclosing a detachable memory unit, but not as otherwise curing the above noted deficiencies of Sawada et al. as applied to corresponding claims 1 and 8, from which claims 6 and 13 correspondingly depend. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 6 and 13 due at least to the combination not disclosing or suggesting the invention recited in claims 1 and 8.

In the Office Action at page 7, the Examiner rejects claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Sawada et al. and Tringali et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,545,891). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner relies on paragraph col. 2, lines 24-27 of Tringali et al. as disclosing a printed circuit board, but not as otherwise curing the above noted deficiencies of the combination of Sawada et al. as applied to claim 22, from which claim 28 depends. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 28 due at least to the combination not disclosing or suggesting the invention recited in claim 22.

CONCLUSION:


In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By: 
James G. McEwen
Registration No. 41,983

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

Date: Nov. 17, 2004